

Morley's Life of Edmund Burke.

There are three aspects in which Burke's admirers evince much reluctance to regard him, but which should not be overlooked in the most rapid survey of his relation to his nation and his time. These features of the theme which are dimmed or foreshortened in the new biography, are the high but not the low of Burke, who should not be dazzled by the glow of Burke's patriotic aims and the lustre of his rhetorical attainments, or silenced by the vibrations of his sonorous eloquence. We must turn our eyes now and then from Burke, the orator and thinker, the framer of far-reaching principles and the prophet of a better future, and we must learn to look at him in the less creditable rôle of an obstructionist and a reactionist. Nor should we omit to inquire by what warp of disposition or infirmity of temper he was incapacitated for concerted action, and on the rare occasions when he was able to rise above the conflicting judgments of contemporaries and of posterity. And first, when we consider him in the light of an obstructionist, we shall perceive ourselves signally aided in gauging the range and value of his political philosophy. It was in the year 1770, at a momentous juncture in the career of the country, that Burke bent all the powers of his ripened intellect and large private influence to stem the current of fast discontent, to perplex and divide the counsels of well-intentioned statesmen, and to consolidate the most grievous and flagrant abuses in the existing system of popular government. The course of his life and of facts will show that mainly on Burke's shoulders rests the odium of prolonging the monstrous anomaly of rotten boroughs, of postponing for two generations the enlargement of the franchise, and of blocking for half a century the course of constitutional reform. At that time Burke may be described as the motive power and master spirit of the whole Whig party, since he was the tongue and pen of its most disinterested, progressive, and popular orator, nominally controlled by the Marquis of Rockingham. There was a burning desire throughout the non-representative part of the country to see some of the part of the Whig leaders that the suffrage needed widening, and the House of Commons reconstruction. Burke might, if he had chosen, have given a directness, unanimity, and vehemence to the movement which nothing could have long withstood, seeing that the Crown's power of resistance was then almost entirely inoperative. But after the persistent and tolerated encroachments of the Napoleonic wars. The precise converse of this attitude was taken by the brilliant rhetorician, in whom American Federalists were subsequently to recognize the model of a true republican. When, in his famous pamphlet on the rights of the Colonies, he had already found the cure for the political disorders of 1770, he insisted on contenting himself with what he should have known to be grossly inadequate prescriptions. He vigorously and successfully denounced all the remedies which the various sections of the opposition proposed against the existing government, and he refused to join the House. The Constitutional Society, for instance, was clamoring for frequent Parliaments, for the exclusion of placemen from the House, and the increase of the county representation. The Duke of Richmond and his following demanded universal suffrage, equal representation, and a restriction of the House of Lords. Burke, however, was content to do nothing. What was even more significant of the general awakening to the true cause of the mischief, and the right method of treatment, Wilkes proposed to disfranchise the rotten boroughs, to increase the county constituencies, and to bestow members on rich, populous trading towns. Fifty-six years afterward, such were the honorable purposes and wise designs of his co-workers, whilst Burke, who, with the exception of a single term, sat for rotten boroughs all his life, obstinately refused to countenance any of these proposals, and by any arrangement of the kind, or by any appeal to the people, contrived to frustrate any plan of efficient action, and balked the reasonable hopes of a disinherited nation. Those hasty persons who quote Burke as an oracle of democratic doctrine would do well to ponder his queer restriction of the suffrage, and his efforts to secure a counterfeit legislature. Thus he could not scruple to declare that it would be more conformable to the spirit of the Constitution "by lessening the number to add to the weight and independency of our voters." Or again, that "considering the immense and dangerous character of election, it is grossly improper that venality, the corruption of manners, the idleness and profligacy of the lower sort of voters, no prudent man would venture to increase such an evil." In another place he denounces that "the people have enough of speculation in the closet, or of exertion in the street, to elect a petent judge, either of the detail of particular measures, or of general schemes of policy." No wonder that such declarations and a policy

Before glancing at Burke's attitude toward the great regenerative movement of the eighteenth century, let us look for a moment at those personal traits which seem to have unfitted him for a political co-operation with the Whigs and Tories. One of these traits, that of such amiable and social qualities that the councils of his party never received a seat in the Cabinet, or a place higher than that of Paymaster of the Forces, calls for some explanation. Singularly cool and sagacious as his rational and practical nature was, his dependence on passion was the first and most conspicuous of his faults. He was the first to violate them, and the forms of temper and discretion were notorious. His frantic animosity, for instance, against political opponents often carried him so far as to breed a positive reaction in those who listened to him. Thus, Miss Burney remarked that "a letter from Burke to Mr. Pitt, signed by him, would have been a thunder-bolt, and the indiscriminate invective poured upon Warren Hastings. And Whig observer wrote that Burke's "manly oblique and insolent pamphlets against the late Government, and his more than his shining qualities, were the cause of his being excluded from the Cabinet." As a member of the coalition first of Burke, as to say the least, supremely injudicious. He arbitrarily restored, it appears, to their position two clerks who had been suspended for malversation, and against whom proceedings were pending in the House of Commons; for this, moreover, in the House, he showed an irritation which would have hurried him to gross lengths if Fox and Sheridan had not, by main force, pulled him down into his seat by the tails of his coat. We may note further that upon the same uncontrollable passion is charged the outbreak of his letter to the Duke of Devonshire, which seems to have been almost wholly unprovoked, and to which his friend replied with tears. We may also mention that Burke's violence in the course of the regency debates produced strong disapproval in the public and downward consideration in his own party. On the subject of the regency, he was, as we have seen, an eye-witness, as having been "wilder than ever and laid himself and his party more open than ever speaker did. He is fully personified, though shaking his cap and bowing under the laurel of genius." The late Lord Lyndhurst, who was one of the ablest subjects frequently discussed by those who were concerned in it, was once asked by an eminent man of our own time why the Whigs kept Burke out of their Cabinets. "Burke," he cried; "he was so violent, so overbearing, so arrogant, so intractable, that to have got on with him in a Cabinet would have been utterly and completely impracticable." The Duke of Devonshire's influence was thrice fatal to his best friends, that, according to Mr. Morley's admission, he was responsible for the break up of the Whig Cabinet after Lord Rockingham's death; that he ruined the coalition ministry by insisting on a wildly impracticable measure, and that, finally, he was the cause of the Whig Government's fall by his clamor against French regeneration, we can easily account for the modest posts accorded to him by his colleagues without invoking national prejudices or the jealousy of old Whig families. If Burke failed to profit by his few opportunities of executive usefulness, it was not that he was deficient in the appointment to congenial infirmities of temperament, just as we should like to attribute the far-reaching harm inflicted by his obstructive and reactionary acts to unconscious defect of knowledge and misarrangement of judgment.

It cannot easily be forgotten by those who recognize in the French upheaval of '89 the cause of the world's progress, that the world has seen, that in a conspicuous and superlative sense Burke must be held accountable for the injurious coalition organized to strangle the new birth, and which evoked all the horrors kindled by panic and despair. Does any student of French history doubt that the Whig Government of 1792-1793 was the direct menace of assault and ruin from without and from within, to the march of allied armies levied at British instigation, and the mutiny of their own provinces fomented by British gold and on any pretence of English history, though he should look no further than the pages of Mr. Morley's *French Revolution*, that Burke was the chief partner and promoter of such an odious enterprise? There is a current, but strangely erroneous, impression that Pitt is to be blamed because he happened to be Prime Minister for the first time, and that the French Revolution was very different, as Mr. Morley indicates, notwithstanding his willingness to lend and extend the consequences of Burke's savage, headlong, infectious, and most calamitous declamations. The English nation was indubitably disposed to view with interest and sympathy the upstart of the French Revolution, and the Whig party was outspoken in their eager approval of the wholesome innovation introduced by the National Assembly, while Pitt with the Tory party behind him, concurred in hailing the auspicious dawn of a new era. But for Burke and his lurid, penetrating, sinister, contagious bile, the French Revolution would have been the feeling of Englishmen, and it certainly must have been, had the matchless powers of the

cessible in print, and profiting by the assistance of such specially qualified scholars as Prof. George M. Lane of Harvard University and Dr. Gustavus Fischer of New Brunswick. The results of their unmitigated labors for several years are now given to the public in a large volume of 300 pages, bound in cloth.

Not only to the classical student, but to the general reader concerned to gain authentic information in a clear and succinct form, such book is replete with interest and suggestion. A little reflection will disclose how broad a field of knowledge must be warily surveyed and diligently worked in order to collect, verify, compare, and collate the numerous linguistic materials out of which a dictionary is constructed. In the case of a Latin lexicon we expect to learn the correct graphic form of the characters employed by the classical writer as well as the process of evolution and divergence which these underwent and to the extent to which the language has diverged from its source with the latest and most authoritative deductions and discoveries flowing from the scrutiny and comparison of manuscripts or the relatively modern study of inscription.

We also look to find some explicit and trustworthy account of the Roman pronunciation so often an open question as to the pronomen *pro* as compared with a distinguished author or soldier it may be with some assurance that the person contemplated would recognize his own name. We need not say that in this respect no essential improvement has taken place within the past thirty years—an improvement stimulated, and even aided, by the study of the cognate branch of orthographical inquiry. Again, as regards etymology, we have a rich

The names and attributes of deities were to be found defined and interpreted in the new dictionary, with a reasonable amount of attention to the results of comparative mythology so far as those may be considered fixed or certified by general agreement among scholars. The characteristics and functions of the genuine Latin divinities are differentiated from those of the Greek gods and goddesses in whom the Romans of the late republic and the empire were themselves eager to recognize identity. The truth of course was that Jupiter, Saturn, Jupiter and Vesta were the same deity, and that the Greeks and Romans borrowed from their common ancestors, and for some time preserved their primeval lineaments. It seems to us that the article on Jupiter in this volume is inadequate than we might have expected from such a scholar as Mr. Wissowa. He tells us that the word Zeus (*Jovis*) is akin to the Sanscrit verb *jag*, to shine, but nothing is said of the personification, *Dyaus*, "the bringer one." Nor is any collective notice given to the epithets which in the Roman worship taken by athletes themselves to the simple confession that they were "Jovian," or that they thought of no denoting different deities. Such were Jupiter *Leucostius*, the god of the bright daylight sky, widely worshipped throughout Italy, and Jupiter *Somauius*, god of the nightly heaven, who at last was pronounced identical with Jupiter *Favonius*, to whom a Roman General, Julius Caesar, General of the enemy brought his spoils in triumph, and Jupiter *Stator*, supposed by the Romans themselves to be the "Stayner" or "Stabilizer," but who is now known to have been the same name given to him in India, for he was the god to whom the soldiers referred upon him because he was the god who would crush his foe, but we observe that this lexicon cites Ovid's story to account for it.

The attributes assigned to Mars, Hercules and Mercurius do not appear to be stated very fully, though there are many descriptions, especially in the two latter cases, swar much better to the exceptions of the Greek deities which have been confounded with them. Unlike Ares, Mars or Minerva was primarily the god of war, but the god of growth and agriculture, and the god of commerce, which he was often known, and hence the consecration to him of the first fruits of the year, and the season of the spring, the name of the first month (*Martius*) being transferred from his own name. Again, Hercules in the old Roman mythos was a god of the forest, of strength and large property, at first considered mainly of land and farm stock, he grew to be the guardian of property in general and so of commerce, But he had never anything in common with the son of Zeus and Hera, nor with the god of commerce, Mercurius, whom this dictionary seems to identify with Hermes, the Romans knew in

capacity of prompt reaction and active circulation can be secured by the habitual application of cold water, followed, of course, the requisite amount of friction. In his essay made against the morning bath he will not admit that the so-called hardening process can be very much aided by the use of cold water. Curiously enough, however, he takes account positively enough in his suggestion for the right treatment of cold feet. Reminding us that millions of persons are constant sufferers from chilliness of the extremities, he says the most "troublesome sensation" of "overcoming numbness" in the dip the feet in cold water after which, of course, they should be briskly rubbed with a crash towel or hair mitten until they are in a glow. "Pursue the practice," he continues, "twice daily, and in a short time your feet will remain warm for hours." It is a logical conclusion that if the feet of a well-to-do member should not answer in a normal condition for the whole body. Of course nobody would claim that the cold morning bath is suited to all persons, or to the same person at all epochs of life or in all grades of physical condition. There are times when women, especially, are so cold that they are well advised, in like manner, young children also gradually be accustomed to the shock of immersion. If, indeed, their use of the cold bath should not always be regulated by medical advice, then, to a male adult who finds upon experience the effects of cold water on his own system, possibly may reasonably estimate the beneficial influence of cold water on his own system. It should be sure, however, that the experience has been fairly tried—that he has proceeded in degrees from a bath slightly tepid, or just up to chilliness, to water suffered to remain at the temperature of the atmosphere, and finally to pure before plunging into the untempered water freshly drawn from pipe or well.

In a chapter pertinently headed "Pulmonology," the author has collected a good many facts and suggestions bearing on the subject of cold water. He points out that the quantity of air required to maintain the temperature of the body is not the same as the quantity of fresh air required by a single adult in a given room, yet twenty-five hundred cubic feet per hour, is generally deemed the smallest amount compatible with comfort. Of course, if the room's air supply should be greater according to the number of persons in the room—for instance, needing some 4,500 cubic feet per hour. Dr. Osmond applies these data to our household economy with interesting results. He takes what may be considered an average room of average size in a so-called comfortable house, and finds that a room of five feet square and twelve feet high, containing, therefore, 2,700 cubic feet of air, or a little more than enough to serve one person sixty minutes, is the question is, will it be renewed after the expiration of the hour? To some extent, and to a certain degree, it will be renewed, and through, but in a few seconds, it will be

ally other business.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN— Sir: Please inform me of the address of the American Consul in the United States. JAS. MORAN, 221 East 124th St.

Yes, Sir. Was born in this country. I am over 35 years of age. These people that the Electrical Colleges choose him to the office and he is not counted out.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN— Sir: Will you please inform me through the columns of The Sun, the address of the New York Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals?

No.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN— Sir: Are the citizens of the District of Columbia entitled to vote for President and Vice President?

No.

The Learned Young Ladies of Boston

From the Harvard Cyclops

"Where is your father, my dear maid?"
"I am going to the Annex," she said.

"What do you there, my pretty maid?"
"I am going to be cultured," she said.

"What are your studies, my pretty maid?"
"Calculus and Quaternions," she said.

"Then when will you marry, my pretty maid?"

STAMPING OUT SLANDER.

[illegible]